

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-9, 12 and 19 are cancelled.

Upon entry of the amendment, Claim 10-11 and 13-18 will be active.

Support for each amended claim is found at the originally filed claims and throughout the specification. Additionally, support for the feature “wherein the thermally polymerizable mixture does not comprise monomers other than the multifunctional macromonomer” of present Claim 10 is found, for example, at MPEP 2173.05(i), that describes, in part “Any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure. If alternative elements are positively recited in the specification, they may be explicitly excluded in the claims,” combined with page 2, lines 8-9, of the originally filed specification, that describes “monomers or prepolymers.” Because monomers are a positively recited alternative element, under MPEP 2173.05(i), the monomers may be excluded from the claims.

No new matter is believed to have been added.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 10-11, 13-14, and 17-18 as being unpatentable in view of Rockrath is respectfully traversed, because Rockrath does not describe or suggest, and in fact “teaches away from,” the feature of present Claim 10, “wherein the thermally polymerizable mixture does not comprise monomers other than the multifunctional macromonomer.”

Rockrath’s polymerizations of Rockrath’s polysiloxane macromonomer are conducted in the presence of monomers such as “ethylhexyl acrylate, hydroxyethyl methacrylate, styrene, etc.,” (see column 24, lines 15-43 of Rockrath). Thus, when Rockrath polymerizes, Rockrath’s polymerization solution includes a polysiloxane macromonomer and monomers.

In contrast, present Claim 10, and the claims depending therefrom, contain the feature

“wherein the thermally polymerizable mixture does not comprise monomers other than the multifunctional macromonomer.”

Accordingly, Rockrath does not describe or suggest every feature of present Claim 10, and the claims depending therefrom; and in fact, Rockrath “teaches away from” a feature of present Claim 10. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 10-11, 13-14 and 17-18 as being unpatentable over Baumgart is respectfully traversed because Baumgart does not describe or suggest, and in fact “teaches away from,” the feature of present Claim 10, “wherein the thermally polymerizable mixture does not comprise monomers other than the multifunctional macromonomer.”

Baumgart, in part, describes the presence of “at least one polysiloxane macromonomer...” and “at least one tris(alkoxycarbonylamino)triazine as crosslinking agent” (see the Abstract of Baumgart). The cross-linking agent of Baumgart is a monomer.

Accordingly, Baumgart does not describe or suggest every feature of present Claim 10, and the claims depending therefrom; and in fact, Baumgart “teaches away from” a feature of present Claim 10. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 10-11 and 13-14 as being unpatentable in view of Arkens is respectfully traversed, because Applicants submit Arkens does not describe or suggest, and in fact “teaches away from,” the feature of present Claim 10, “wherein the thermally polymerizable mixture does not comprise monomers other than the multifunctional macromonomer.” Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 10-11, 13-14 and 17-18 as being unpatentable over Engelke in view of Rockrath is respectfully traversed. Engelke describes polymerizing mixtures that contain a siloxane macromonomer and a variety of monomers (see for example,

column 18, Table 1.1). Because the macromonomer is mixed with monomers in Engelke's system, Engelke does not describe or suggest the feature of present Claim 10, that the thermally polymerizable mixture "does not comprise monomers other than the multifunctional macromonomer," and in fact, Engelke "teaches away from" this feature. The disclosure of Rockrath does not cure the deficiencies of Engelke. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 10-14 and 17-18 as being unpatentable over Engelke in view of Baumgart is respectfully traversed. As described above, Engelke does not describe or suggest all of the features of present Claim 10, and the claims depending therefrom, and in fact, "teaches away from" the feature of present Claim 10 that the thermally polymerizable mixture "does not comprise monomers other than the multifunctional macromonomer." The disclosure of Baumgart does not cure the deficiencies of Engelke. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 15-16 as being unpatentable over Arkens in view of Rockrath is respectfully traversed. As described above, Applicants submit Arkens does not describe or suggest every feature of present Claim 10, and the claims depending therefrom; and in fact, Arkens "teaches away from" the feature of present Claim 10 and the claims depending therefrom that the thermally polymerizable mixture "does not comprise monomers other than the multifunctional macromonomer." Rockrath does not cure the deficiencies of Arkens. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 10 and 15 as being unpatentable over Beck is respectfully traversed. The coatings of Beck, as described at Table 1, column 6, of Beck, all contain methyldiethanolamine, which is a monomer. In contrast, present Claim 10, and the

claims depending therefrom, have, as a feature, that the thermally polymerizable mixture “does not comprise monomers other than the multifunctional macromonomer.”

Accordingly, Beck does not describe or suggest, and in fact “teaches away from” the feature of present Claim 10 and the claims depending therefrom, that the thermally polymerizable mixture “does not comprise monomers other than the multifunctional macromonomer.”

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claim 16 as being unpatentable over Beck in view of Rockrath is respectfully traversed. As described above, Beck does not describe or suggest the feature of present Claim 10 and the claims depending therefrom, that that the thermally polymerizable mixture “does not comprise monomers other than the multifunctional macromonomer.” The disclosure of Rockrath does not cure the deficiencies of Beck.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

Applicants submit the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles J. Andres, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 57,537

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)